



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/712,955

11/13/2003

Michele Hallak-Stamler

SRAD 639

9541

61650 7590 08/22/2008

MYERS WOLIN, LLC
100 HEADQUARTERS PLAZA
North Tower, 6th Floor
MORRISTOWN, NJ 07960-6834

EXAMINER

KUMAR, ANIL N

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2174

NOTIFICATION DATE

DELIVERY MODE

08/22/2008

ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

patent@myerswolyn.com

<i>Interview Summary</i>	Application No. 10/712,955	Applicant(s) HALLAK-STAMLER, MICHELE	
	Examiner ANIL N. KUMAR	Art Unit 2174	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) ANIL N. KUMAR. (3) Biran s. Myers (Attorney).

(2) _____. (4) Michael Nen-Shimon (tech advisor).

Date of Interview: 13 August 2008.

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference
c) ☐ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.
If Yes, brief description: _____.

Claim(s) discussed: 1.

Identification of prior art discussed: van Rietschote (US 6,575,778).

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☒ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: We discussed the independent claim 1 and generally discussed the invention, as it applies to prior art. The applicant suggested that although the prior art may read on parts of the invention, it does not explicitly teach part of the claimed invention - automatically duplicating the configuration parameters- and the examiner has agreed to review the prior art in view of the applicant's explanation of the invention and the filed Arguments/Remarks..

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

	/Anil N. Kumar/
--	-----------------